

# Namibia - Communal Land Support

Report generated on: March 12, 2018

Visit our data catalog at: <https://data.mcc.gov/evaluations/index.php>

# Overview

## Identification

---

**COUNTRY**

Namibia

**EVALUATION TITLE**

Communal Land Support

**EVALUATION TYPE**

Independent Performance Evaluation

**ID NUMBER**

DD-MCC-NM-NORC-CLS-2017-V01

## Version

---

**VERSION DESCRIPTION**

- v01: Edited, anonymous dataset for public distribution.

## Overview

---

**ABSTRACT**

The Millennium Challenge Corporation's (MCC) Compact with the Government of the Republic of Namibia aimed to reduce poverty through economic growth fostered by investment in the education, tourism and agriculture sectors. MCC's investment in the agriculture sector included the Communal Land Support (CLS) Sub-Activity, to clarify and strengthen land rights and improve land use and management in the Northern Communal Area (NCA) of Namibia. The CLS Sub-Activity was a \$ 3,410,700 program that began in 2009, and concluded in 2014.

MCC commissioned an independent evaluation of CLS, which is being carried out by NORC at the University of Chicago (NORC). This is a performance evaluation that uses qualitative data collection and analysis to assess the effects of CLS activity components on land administration in Namibia, as well as for beneficiaries on the ground. The present report presents the results of an Initial Performance Evaluation (IPE) focusing on four sets of relatively short-term outcomes that would be expected to occur shortly after the conclusion of the project. These are increasing knowledge and awareness about land rights, fostering effective policy dialogue, establishing processes, procedures, and tools that have been adopted by the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement (MLR), and improving tenure security for beneficiaries. A potential subsequent Follow-On Performance Evaluation may address longer-term outcomes such as economic benefits resulting from improved range management and investment, as well as the sustainability of CLS.

**Evaluation Questions:**

1. How has CLS contributed to increasing knowledge and awareness about land rights, laws, and procedures in the CLRA?

1a) Do individuals know what land registration means? Are they aware of their responsibility to register land or their rights and responsibilities to participate in community-level land management? Are they aware of the obligation various levels of leadership have under the Land Act? Are they aware of the venues for appealing land decisions? To what extent have the communication and civic education components of CLS contributed to individuals' understanding of these issues? Have the CLS outreach and communication activities changed citizens' views about land issues, and if so how?

1b) Do authorities with responsibilities under the CLRA (including local community leaders, TAs, CLBs, and MLR officials) understand (i) land rights under the CLRA as well as (ii) their roles and responsibilities under the law? Are they capable of carrying out those responsibilities? To what extent has this understanding improved as a result of the CLS training activities?

1c) To what extent have female land users and authorities/leaders roles changed as compared to prior to CLS? To what extent are they more empowered and effective? To what extent is this due to CLS?

1d) How do individual land holders assess the performance of various authorities (TAs, MLR officials, etc.) in their roles under the Land Act?

2. To what extent was the support for policy dialogue provided by CLS effective?

2a) In the priority policy areas in which CLS support focused, what changes in legislation, regulations, or procedures have been adopted?

2b) To what extent were CLS's priority policy areas focused on underlying sources of problems for the holders of rights on the ground, as opposed to issues that may not bring benefits to land users?

2c) To what extent has CLS, its support for policy dialogue, and its outreach and communications campaigns contributed to or changed the debate about land issues in Namibia?

3. To what extent has CLS had broader impacts on the approach to land registration in Namibia?

3a) In what ways do the various components of the CLS approach to land administration reflect improvements over previous approaches to land registration in Namibia along the dimensions of transparency, accountability, cost effectiveness, quality and accessibility of information, and/or sustainability?

3b) To what extent did CLS result in changes to the registration process followed by the MLR? To what extent are these changes sustained over time?

3c) Are there aspects of CLS that reflect improvements over previous approaches along dimensions of transparency, accountability, cost effectiveness, quality and accessibility of information, and/or sustainability, but were not adopted by MLR? If so, what are these aspects and why didn't the MLR adopt them?

3d) Did procedures introduced by CLS improve the inclusion and participation of residents and landholders in land registration and land management processes? Did procedures result in the perception of increased transparency and accountability?

4. How and to what extent has CLS helped improve perceptions related to tenure security? To what extent has CLS helped to improve tenure security for women and other vulnerable groups?

4a) To what extent do holders of land rights in the NCAs perceive those rights as secure? What are the main sources of tenure insecurity? How have these perceptions changed since implementation of CLS, and to what extent were they affected by CLS? How do these perceptions differ among different types of land users, as well as women, the poor, and vulnerable groups?

4b) What kinds of land disputes are common, and how prevalent are they? How has the prevalence of various types of disputes increased or decreased over time, and to what extent is CLS responsible for any changes? How do these perceptions differ among different types of land users, as well as women, the poor, and vulnerable groups?

4c) How has the capacity of authorities (i.e., TA, CLBs) to resolve land disputes changed as a result of CLS?

4d) Has CLS led to a greater sense of empowerment and control for women over household land resources? Did joint application forms have an effect on spousal rights?

4e) What are the perceived benefits and drawbacks (if any) of registering land and obtaining leaseholds?

The key findings for each evaluation question as well as some additional findings are summarized as follows:

Evaluation Question 1: How has CLS contributed to increasing knowledge and awareness about land rights, laws, and procedures in the CLRA?

- Nearly all of our NCA resident focus groups were able to collectively demonstrate a solid understanding of the process of land registration, though there were some individuals who expressed concern over their level of understanding about land issues, particularly grazing rights.

- NCA residents' credit communications and outreach campaigns with improving their understanding of land issues, while land officials in the NCAs also felt that CLS outreach and communications had an impact in improving residents understanding on land issues.

- CLS employed multiple channels of information transmission in communications campaigns which was important.

- The results of the Quantitative Knowledge Assessment Tool (QKAT) show that nearly all respondents understood that the duration of customary land rights is not limited, and that the Traditional Authority has the responsibility to give grazing rights. However, only one respondent understood that parcels in excess of 50 ha can be registered as leaseholds only. NCA officials express mixed confidence in their understanding of the CLRA and their ability to carry out those functions. NCA residents have mixed opinions about the capacity of land officials at various levels.
- NCA officials (MLR Staff, CLB members, and TAs) remembered the CLS training and viewed it as valuable.
- Awareness that women have the right to own land has improved over time, with outreach and communications campaigns including CLS making an important contribution. Widows' land rights in particular have been strengthened considerably in recent years, with communications and outreach campaigns such as CLS making an important contribution. Nonetheless, important limitations remain to understanding and protection of women's land rights.

Evaluation Question 2: To what extent was the support for policy dialogue provided by CLS effective?

- CLS created procedures and forms for joint registration of customary land rights for both husbands and wives, which made an important contribution to formalizing and protecting women's land rights. However, at the time of the evaluation, joint titles had not yet been issued, which could affect longer-term outcomes.
- CLS had several other accomplishments related to policy dialogue, including creating the procedure for registering a parcel over 20 hectares, establishing minimum qualifications for Communal Land Boards that are in use by the MLR, and establishing a procedure to allow local communities to obtain "head leases" on land for tourism.
- CLS made progress towards broader registration of group land rights, but was not able to establish and institutionalize an approach to group registration. Guidelines were issued and discussions started, but grazing rights need to be adopted and certificates issued for longer term outcomes to be met.
- CLS fostered awareness and initiated dialogue around several important land policy issues, and the communications and outreach components helped to stimulate interest and awareness about land issues in the NCAs.

Evaluation Question 3: To what extent has CLS had broader impacts on the approach to land registration in Namibia?

- On the whole, the tools and procedures developed by CLS are considered improvements over previous approaches and most are in use by the MLR. CLS's approach of engaging closely with the communities also served to demonstrate the value of a participatory approach and made an impression on MLR staff.
- CLS was effective in working closely with the MLR to facilitate take-up of the CLS tools and procedures.
- The NCLAS-2 land information system presented some challenges and has not been fully rolled out, although it appears the MLR still intends to adopt NCLAS-2.

Evaluation Question 4: How and to what extent has CLS helped improve perceptions of tenure security? To what extent has CLS helped to improve perceptions of tenure security for women and other vulnerable groups?

- Fear of government expropriation over leaseholds and mistrust of the village headperson were the most common sources of individual tenure insecurity cited by our respondents, though most respondents express confidence in their land rights.
- There were no gains in tenure security for grazing or commonage and this remains a point of confusion for several NCA residents.
- Most respondents felt that CLS mapping and registration had improved the security of their land rights, particularly so for women.
- The CLS mapping and registration process has led to an increase in land conflicts in the short term in some cases, but over time CLS certification is expected to decrease incidence of land conflict.
- Land certification has improved women's empowerment, particularly with respect to protecting widow's rights.

Additional Findings

- In the areas where CLS did mapping and verification, many residents reported that they had not yet received their certificates.

- The most frequently cited land-related concern by our NCA resident respondents was decreasing availability of commonage land on which to graze cattle.

**EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

Other (Performance Evaluation)

**UNITS OF ANALYSIS**

Individuals

**KIND OF DATA**

Other

**TOPICS**

Topic	Vocabulary	URI
Land		
Capacity Building and Institutional Development		

**KEYWORDS**

Aerial map, NCLAS, Commonage, Land registration

## Coverage

**GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE**

Qualitative data (not representative)

**UNIVERSE**

A total of 56 FGDs were completed during data collection. Of these, 52 FGDs were conducted in local villages in the four operational areas: 13 in Uukwambi (Oshana region, with a few villages overlapping in Omusati region); 13 in Ongandjera (Omusati region); and 26 interviews in Ohangwena region (in Omauni and Okongo West operational areas). The remaining 4 FGDs with MLR regional staff (2 FGDs), CLS members (1 FGD) and TAs (1 FGD) were administered at a central place where discussants could easily meet.

## Producers and Sponsors

**PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S)**

Name	Affiliation
NORC at the University of Chicago	University of Chicago

**FUNDING**

Name	Abbreviation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC	

## Metadata Production

**METADATA PRODUCED BY**

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC		Review of Metadata

**DATE OF METADATA PRODUCTION**

2018-02-22

**DDI DOCUMENT VERSION**

Version 1.0 (February 2018)

**DDI DOCUMENT ID**

DD-MCC-NM-NORC-CLS-2017-V01

## MCC Compact and Program

---

**COMPACT OR THRESHOLD**

Namibia Compact

**PROGRAM**

Communal Land Support (CLS) Sub-Activity

**MCC SECTOR**

Land (Land)

**PROGRAM LOGIC**

Please refer to Figure 1 of Final Evaluation Report

**PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS**

Civic Education and Outreach Campaigns: Villages in 7 Northern Communal Areas Training and Capacity Building: Traditional Authorities (TAs), Communal Land Boards (CLBs), and Ministry of Lands and Resettlement (MLR) staff Land Verification and Registration: Villages in 7 Northern Communal Areas Policy Review and Procedural Work: N/A

# Sampling

## Study Population

---

A total of 56 FGDs were completed during data collection. Of these, 52 FGDs were conducted in local villages in the four operational areas: 13 in Uukwambi (Oshana region, with a few villages overlapping in Omusati region); 13 in Ongandjera (Omusati region); and 26 interviews in Ohangwena region (in Omauni and Okongo West operational areas). The remaining 4 FGDs with MLR regional staff (2 FGDs), CLS members (1 FGD) and TAs (1 FGD) were administered at a central place where discussants could easily meet.

## Sampling Procedure

---

### Selection Process for Focus Group Discussions Study Sample:

Three villages each were selected from each of the four CLS Operational Areas (OAs) of Uukwambi, Ongandjera, Omauni, and Okongo West. In order to ensure a sample that is as "representative" as possible, the following considerations were taken for fieldwork, during and after a scoping trip:

§ The team avoided villages that were highly atypical in ways that would make their experiences with CLS different from other CLS villages in the operational area. Examples include villages that are particularly small, large, urbanized, or remote with atypical economic activities or standards of living.

§ In Omauni, Okongo West, and Uukwambi, the approach was to identify villages that were broadly reflective of different characteristics of CLS villages in these operational areas, to the greatest extent possible. The villages were selected based on the certificates issued and number of activities that were completed during the MCA period. In addition, geographic locations of the villages and the sizes of villages (number of parcels) were taken into consideration during the selection. The villages with few parcels in the Omauni and Okongo west OA necessitated the need for clustering the larger villages with at least two smaller neighboring villages. Finally, there were only three Phase 2 villages in the Ongandjera OA, so all of these were selected for the FGDs.

§ In order to mobilize community members to participate during data collection, research teams visited the selected villages and interacted with the village headperson to inform them about the data collection and to initiate the recruitment of community members.

# Questionnaires

## Overview

---

The Qualitative Knowledge Assessment Tool (QKAT) was administered to participants in certain FGDs concurrently with the FGD. Participants were asked about the training they received, whether they felt the training helped them understand their responsibilities under the Communal Land Reform Act, and were tested on their knowledge about land rights under the Communal Land Reform Act. A total of 28 cases were collected under the QKAT.



## Data Collection

### Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle
2016-04-01	2016-07-01	N/A

### Data Collection Notes

NORC staff traveled to Namibia March 2 - 18, 2016 to train the UNAM team on the evaluation instruments and undertake the pilot data collection in the NCAs. A few changes were made to the instruments after the pilot and the final data was collected from April - July 2016; with the earliest and latest key informant interviews stretching this time period. All focus group discussions in the NCAs took place between April 4 and April 28, 2016.

After data collection, the data was transcribed into Microsoft Word and entered into Atlas.ti software for coding. All qualitative data transcriptions were finalized and coded by the end of August 2016, after which point the analysis of the qualitative data began in September 2016.

The QKAT was administered to participants of the four FGDs with regional MLR, CLB, and TA officials. A total of 28 QKAT questionnaires were completed and entered using SPSS.

### Questionnaires

The Qualitative Knowledge Assessment Tool (QKAT) was administered to participants in certain FGDs concurrently with the FGD. Participants were asked about the training they received, whether they felt the training helped them understand their responsibilities under the Communal Land Reform Act, and were tested on their knowledge about land rights under the Communal Land Reform Act. A total of 28 cases were collected under the QKAT.

### Data Collectors

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation
University of Namibia	UNAM	University of Namibia

### Supervision

The data collection team was composed of one facilitator and one note-taker per focus group and key informant interview.

## Data Processing

### Data Editing

---

Respondent names and titles were removed from the QKAT survey.

### Other Processing

---

The Evaluation Team developed a code frame to identify and categorize topics raised by respondents relevant to the evaluation questions, and coded the data using the Atlas.ti software package. For each evaluation question, queries using the software as well as a broader reading of the transcripts were used to systematically identify all responses in the data that were relevant to the particular question. These responses were then summarized and excerpted to generate the findings.

## Data Appraisal

No content available